UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION

FILED

OFFEB 19 AH 10: 41

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

STATES OF AMERICA

CASE NO.: 8:03-CR-77-T-30-TBM

IIN AL-ARIAN, I HAMMOUDEH, IN ZAYED BALLUT, IAJI FARIZ

OVERNMENT'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT HATIM NAJI FARIZ'S MOTION TO SUBMIT SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY

he United States of America by Paul I. Perez, United States Attorney, Middle f Florida, hereby responds to defendant Hatim Naji Fariz's Motion to Submit ental Authority:

On February 6, 2004, counsel for defendant Fariz filed the aboveed motion (Doc. 444), which purports to bring to this Court's attention a recent
issued by the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California in
arian Law Project v. Ashcroft, __ F. Supp. 2d __, 2004 WL 112760 (C.D. Cal.
2004) (hereafter referred to as HLP II). In as much as the defendant's filing
argument, counsel for the United States responds accordingly.

HLP II, supra, involved a pre-enforcement civil challenge to the ionality of § 805(a)(2(B) of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing late Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act ("USA PATRIOT d §§ 302 and 303 of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, which prohibit the provision of material support, including "expert advice or

457

te," to designated foreign terrorist organizations. See § 805(a)(2)(B), 18 U.S.C. A(a) and 2339B(a). In that decision, the district court held that the term "expert assistance" was unconstitutionally vague. See HLP II, 2004 WL 112760 at e district court, however, rejected the plaintiffs' remaining claims that the as overbroad, id. at *15, and that the provision criminalized associational id. at 17. The district enjoined the Government from enforcing the prohibition ling "expert advice or assistance" against the named plaintiffs that were found tranding under Article III of the Constitution. Id. at 18. Notably, the court lly declined to grant a nationwide injunction. Id.

In his filing, the defendant asserts that the district court's decision in *HLP* cores his "need to be provided sufficient notice of the types of material support ces that are alleged to be at issue in Count Three of the indictment." *See* ht's Motion, at 3. Defendant's claimed "need" is vastly overstated. Whatever ss the district court in *HLP II* found in the statute does not extend to the his in the indictment. As this Court found in denying the defendant's previous

Specifically, the district court found that the government had "failed to ely distinguish the provision of 'expert advice or assistance' from the provision g' or 'personnel'" that was previously held to be unconstitutionally vague in arian Law Project v. Reno (hereafter HLP I), id. at 14. See Humanitarian Law . Reno, 9 F. Supp. 2d 1176 (C.D. Cal. 1998) (granting plaintiffs' motion for ry injunction of terms "personnel" and "training" on vagueness grounds), aff'd, 1140 (9th Cir. 2000) (affirming grant of a preliminary injunction); Humanitarian ect v. Reno, No. CV 98-1971 ABC (BQRx), 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16729 (C.D. 1) (issuing permanent injunction of terms "personnel" and "training"), aff'd in rev'd in part, 352 F.3d 382 (9th Cir. 2003). To the extent the district court's g was based on HLP I, the government notes that on January 20, 2004, it filed U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit a request for rehearing and g en banc of the HLP I decision. The government's petition is pending.

or a bill of particulars, "the Indictment in this case is highly specific as to the legations supporting each count and, for the most part, clearly exposes the ent's theory as to each defendant's involvement in the alleged criminal See January 21, 2004 Order at 4 (granting in part and denying in part its' motion for bill of particulars). Indeed, only overt acts alleged in ¶¶ 43(234)-st-date the October 26, 2001 PATRIOT Act amendment that added the term dvice and assistance," and those allegations set forth all the essential of the offense with sufficient detail to put the Defendant on notice of the narged against him so that he can properly prepare a defense. See ent's Memorandum in Opposition to Defendant's Hatim Naji Fariz's Motion to Counts Three and Four of the Indictment, at 16 (citing *United States v. Lindh*, upp. 2d 541, 576 (E.D. Va. 2002)).

Accordingly, the government respectfully submits that the district court's in *HLP II* does not warrant reconsideration of this Court's January 21, 2004, nying the defendant's claims that the indictment in this case fails to provide notice.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL I. PEREZ United States Attorney

By:

Terry A. Zitek

Executive Assistant U. S. Attorney

Florida Bar No. 0336531

400 North Tampa Street, Suite 3200

Tampa, Florida 33602

Telephone: (813) 274-6000 Facsimile: (813) 274-6246

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was sent

hall this $\frac{19^{th}}{1000}$ day of $\frac{FEGRUNRY}{1000}$, 2004, to the following:

William B. Moffitt, Esquire
Asbill Moffitt & Boss, Chtd.
The Pacific House
1615 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20009
Counsel for Sami Amin Al-Arian

Linda Moreno, Esquire 1718 E. 7th Avenue, Suite 201 Tampa, Florida 33605 Counsel for Sami Amin Al-Arian

Stephen N. Bernstein, Esquire Post Office Box 1642 Gainesville, Florida 32602 Counsel for Sameeh Hammoudeh

Bruce G. Howie, Esquire 5720 Central Avenue St. Petersburg, Florida 33707 Counsel for Ghassan Zayed Ballut

Kevin T. Beck, Assistant Federal Public Defender Federal Public Defender's Office 400 North Tampa Street, Suite 2700 Tampa, Florida 33602 Counsel for Hatim Naji Fariz

Wadie E. Said, Assistant Federal Public Defender Federal Public Defender's Office 400 North Tampa Street, Suite 2700 Tampa, Florida 33602 Co-Counsel for Hatim Naji Fariz

Terry A. Zitek

Executive Assistant United States Attorney